

THE LIBERATOR.

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY,

AT THE ANTI-SLAVERY OFFICE, 21, CORNHILL.

ROBERT F. WALLCUT, GENERAL AGENT.

All remittances are to be made, and all letters relating to the pecuniary concerns of the paper are to be directed, (*post paid*), to the General Agent.

TERMS.—\$2 50 per annum; or if payment be made within three months from the time of subscription, \$2 00.

Six copies will be sent to one address for two dollars, if payment be forwarded in advance.

ADVERTISEMENTS making less than one square, inserted three times for 75 cents—one square for 1 00.

Editorial Committee.—FRANCIS JACKSON, ELIAS GRAY LORING, EDWARD QUINCY, SAMUEL PHILIPSON, WENDELL PHILLIPS. [This committee is responsible for the financial economy of the paper, and not for any of its debts.]

WM. LLOYD GARRISON, EDITOR.

VOL. XVIII.—NO. 36.

REFUGE OF OPPRESSION.

COLONIZATION, &c.

We find in the New York Journal of Commerce, the following letter from the Hon. Nathan Appleton:

PITTSFIELD, August 9, 1843.

Dear Sir—I have yours of yesterday, 9, calling my attention to the Colony of Liberia, and asking for a donation to encourage emigration to it.

I consider the establishment of that colony a very interesting event, and now, as I have heretofore done, cheerfully contribute to its support. I consider it interesting as making the experiment how far the African race is capable of civilization, and a regularly organized government. This is a question of deep interest. This colony has made a good beginning, under circumstances highly favorable to the full development of the powers of the mind, and I hope it may continue to fulfil the sanguine expectations of its founders. A mod-est increase by emigration from this country would be most favorable in calling into action the self-reliance so necessary to success. The effect of the colony in civilizing the large native population under their government or influence, is the greatest solicitude.

I do not consider the efforts of the Colonization Society as having any appropriate bearing on the question of the extinction of slavery in the United States. The power of emigration is as small as to be but a drop from the bucket compared to the annual increase of the black population. It is a relief, to be sure, as affording an asylum for the few slaves occasionally emancipated in the slave States. But the want of education and of moral character in most of these emancipated slaves makes it questionable whether a great increase of their number would be favorable to the experiment of civilization which it is so important to carry out.

I have been surprised to see so little attention paid to the question of emigration of blacks to the West Indies, especially to the English islands, where free labor is so much wanted, and to which the expense of emigration is so trifling compared to that of Africa. It appears to me a subject well worth the attention of the Colonization Society.

African slavery is the exciting topic of the day. It is a curse which has been entailed upon us. I consider it a tremendous social and political evil. It degrades labor, the very foundation of civilization. It is politically an element of weakness in the State which adopts it. But we of New England are free from it, and ought to be able to teach it at ready and easily. I think the South wrong in their right to introduce slavery among their new free. Their arguments appear to me weak and baseless. It is difficult to found a natural right on an original wrong. This claim could be resisted as a matter of principle by the whole of the free States. At the same time, as a practical question, it is probably unimportant, since there is apparently no inducement to introduce slave labor in either Oregon, California or New Mexico. The whole ground was yielded.

To the extension of slavery in the slave States, secured by the Constitution, I see no reason why we of the free States should make ourselves very unhappy about it. Why not leave it to the parties immediately concerned? It is a matter sufficiently troublesome without our interference. Interference in the affairs of others is always distasteful, sometimes hateful—especially when accompanied by the denunciation of sinfulness. Such denunciation comes with an ill grace from fallible humanity. The question of sinfulness should be kept where it belongs, between the individual and his Maker.

As a political question, the abolition of slavery in the slave States has difficulties apparently insurmountable at present. As a question of property it involves an amount of about a thousand millions of dollars. For whatever may be said, slaves are property to all intents and purposes in States which have established slavery; property is essentially the creature of legislation. Was such an amount of property ever voluntarily relinquished or annihilated? Would it be possible to make the owners indemnification on any principle of law or equity? A still greater difficulty remains, the question of political rights. Let visionaries say what they will, there is an impassable gulf which separates the two races, the African and the Caucasian. There is something abhorrent to most people in the mixture of their blood. At all events, as a matter of fact, amalgamation is impossible. Can the two races live together with equal social and political rights? It is believed to be impossible. Whether a change in human nature, the more powerful race will oppress the weaker. Witness the actual state of the Jews in the midst of Christendom.

At the same time, without foreign interference there is little doubt that slavery will gradually be abolished in the most Northern of the slave States. It may be abolished in all of them when slave labor ceases to be profitable. When labor in the cotton-growing region is of no more value than it is in many parts of Europe. No one would accept a slave, white or black, in Ireland.

On the whole, I consider the question of the abolition of slavery in the United States one of those great and difficult problems, entirely beyond the power of man to solve.

Fortunately events of this kind are controlled by a higher and wiser power, on which we may rely with perfect confidence that they will work together for good.

You will thus perceive that I have complied with your request, that I should give you my opinion on the whole of this subject.

I remain, very respectfully,

Yours very obedient servant,

* NATHAN APPLETON.

Rev. J. N. DANFORTH.

MR. VAN BUREN'S LETTER OF ACCEPTANCE.—The letter of Martin Van Buren, accepting the nomination made at Buffalo, is a document which has made two and a half columns in our paper. This crafty politician finds it necessary to pour forth this volley of words, to define his position on the new Buffalo "platform," a platform which has well been named "a Van Buren turn-table." The only thing remarkable in his letter is a seeming reiteration of his former pledge to veto a bill to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia. What he says on this question is a successful attempt to whip the devil around the stump. With him he makes it depend upon "circumstances," like Mr. Cass's visit to Chicago. How ridiculous can it be to suppose that a man as a Free Soil candidate appears, when he finds it necessary, after his nomination, to be so far from the truth as to pretend that he will not veto a bill for free soil.

The claim set up by our Southern brethren, is a departure from the platform raised by our common ancestors, at a period when the chain of our Union was the brightest, and the fraternal feeling between the States that composed it, the strongest. It comes upon the back of a series of events well calculated to awaken, at the North, that deep, and, as it respects ourselves, overwhelming sensation in the public mind, to which I have referred. A brief review of them, at a moment so critical, cannot fail to be useful.

The future condition of the respective States, in regard to the probable continuance or abolition of slavery, were correctly foreseen at the formation of the government. Those of the old thirteen which are now exempt from it, acted under a confident expectation that they would soon become so; whilst those of the number where slavery still exists, could not look forward to an equally favorable result in regard to themselves. It was, therefore,

Drayton, who stole the negroes from this District, has been sentenced to ten years imprisonment in the penitentiary on each of the two cases tried at this trial of the criminal court. Sears has been found guilty on the seventy-one indictments for transportation. The penalty is \$200 for each, or \$14,200 in all. The sale of the negroes of the trial took place by a gentleman from the North who agreed to pay this amount.—[Washington Cor. N. Y. Her-



OUR COUNTRY IS THE WORLD--OUR

BOSTON, FRIDAY,

THE LIBERATOR.

MR. VAN BUREN'S LETTER OF ACCEPT-

ANCE.

The Committee appointed at the Buffalo Convention to inform Mr. Van Buren of his nomination as the Free Soil Candidate for the Presidency, and to solicit his acceptance of the same, addressed him a letter dated New York, Aug. 16, and received from him the following Reply:

LINDENWALD, Aug. 22, 1843.

GENTLEMEN—I have had the honor to receive your letter, giving me official information of the proceedings of the Buffalo Convention. The composition, character and proceedings of that body, as described by you, and the concessions of feeling, and to some extent of opinion also, on the part of its members, which enabled them to unite their exertions upon a common, and to the country, a vitally important question, show it to have been governed by a pure and lofty patriotism, and demand from me a grateful acknowledgement for the expression of confidence you have communicated.

I do not consider the efforts of the Colonization Society as having any appropriate bearing on the question of the extinction of slavery in the United States. The power of emigration is as small as to be but a drop from the bucket compared to the annual increase of the black population. It is a relief, to be sure, as affording an asylum for the few slaves occasionally emancipated in the slave States. But the want of education and of moral character in most of these emancipated slaves makes it questionable whether a great increase of their number would be favorable to the experiment of civilization which it is so important to carry out.

This refusal would have been equally as decisive, if it had been certain that they would have had it in their power to carry their friendly wishes into effect. The New York Delegation to the Utica Convention requested my opinions, in regard to the obligations imposed upon them by the Baltimore nominations, and the constitutionality and expediency of a prohibition, by Congress, of the introduction of Slavery into territories now free from it. They also asked my consent to the use of my name, by the Convention, as its candidate for the presidency. I cheerfully gave them my opinions they desired, but declined the last request absolutely. That we of New England are free from it, and ought to be able to teach it at ready and easily. I think the South wrong in their right to introduce slavery among their new free. Their arguments appear to me weak and baseless. It is difficult to found a natural right on an original wrong. This claim could be resisted as a matter of principle by the whole of the free States. At the same time, as a practical question, it is probably unimportant, since there is apparently no inducement to introduce slave labor in either Oregon, California or New Mexico. The whole ground was yielded.

But this is not the only, nor even the most retrospective view which we are compelled to take of the present pretensions of the friends of the slaveholding States, themselves were prominently active in the measure—the ordinance of 1787—by which six new States were first designed to be, and five actually were, arrayed on the same side. These added to the seven in which Slavery had been, or was expected to be abolished, would make the division in this regard, twelve to six. The evidence we possess of the circumstances and dispositions of the times, warrants us in assuming that no one, at that day, anticipated that this difference in the respective conditions of the States, in regard to Slavery, would ever be overcome or neutralized by the accession to the confederacy, of new slaveholding States. Yet, in the brief period which has elapsed—we may well say, brief, when viewed in connection with such great results—we have witnessed the addition of nine slaveholding, and only three non-slaveholding States to the confederacy, beyond those which were provided for before the adoption of the Constitution, making the slaveholding States themselves, more prominently active in the measure—the ordinance of 1787—by which six new States were first designed to be, and five actually were, arrayed on the same side. These added to the seven in which Slavery had been, or was expected to be abolished, would make the division in this regard, twelve to six. The evidence we possess of the circumstances and dispositions of the times, warrants us in assuming that no one, at that day, anticipated that this difference in the respective conditions of the States, in regard to Slavery, would ever be overcome or neutralized by the accession to the confederacy, of new slaveholding States. Yet, in the brief period which has elapsed—we may well say, brief, when viewed in connection with such great results—we have witnessed the addition of nine slaveholding, and only three non-slaveholding States to the confederacy, beyond those which were provided for before the adoption of the Constitution, making the slaveholding States themselves, more prominently active in the measure—the ordinance of 1787—by which six new States were first designed to be, and five actually were, arrayed on the same side. These added to the seven in which Slavery had been, or was expected to be abolished, would make the division in this regard, twelve to six. The evidence we possess of the circumstances and dispositions of the times, warrants us in assuming that no one, at that day, anticipated that this difference in the respective conditions of the States, in regard to Slavery, would ever be overcome or neutralized by the accession to the confederacy, of new slaveholding States. Yet, in the brief period which has elapsed—we may well say, brief, when viewed in connection with such great results—we have witnessed the addition of nine slaveholding, and only three non-slaveholding States to the confederacy, beyond those which were provided for before the adoption of the Constitution, making the slaveholding States themselves, more prominently active in the measure—the ordinance of 1787—by which six new States were first designed to be, and five actually were, arrayed on the same side. These added to the seven in which Slavery had been, or was expected to be abolished, would make the division in this regard, twelve to six. The evidence we possess of the circumstances and dispositions of the times, warrants us in assuming that no one, at that day, anticipated that this difference in the respective conditions of the States, in regard to Slavery, would ever be overcome or neutralized by the accession to the confederacy, of new slaveholding States. Yet, in the brief period which has elapsed—we may well say, brief, when viewed in connection with such great results—we have witnessed the addition of nine slaveholding, and only three non-slaveholding States to the confederacy, beyond those which were provided for before the adoption of the Constitution, making the slaveholding States themselves, more prominently active in the measure—the ordinance of 1787—by which six new States were first designed to be, and five actually were, arrayed on the same side. These added to the seven in which Slavery had been, or was expected to be abolished, would make the division in this regard, twelve to six. The evidence we possess of the circumstances and dispositions of the times, warrants us in assuming that no one, at that day, anticipated that this difference in the respective conditions of the States, in regard to Slavery, would ever be overcome or neutralized by the accession to the confederacy, of new slaveholding States. Yet, in the brief period which has elapsed—we may well say, brief, when viewed in connection with such great results—we have witnessed the addition of nine slaveholding, and only three non-slaveholding States to the confederacy, beyond those which were provided for before the adoption of the Constitution, making the slaveholding States themselves, more prominently active in the measure—the ordinance of 1787—by which six new States were first designed to be, and five actually were, arrayed on the same side. These added to the seven in which Slavery had been, or was expected to be abolished, would make the division in this regard, twelve to six. The evidence we possess of the circumstances and dispositions of the times, warrants us in assuming that no one, at that day, anticipated that this difference in the respective conditions of the States, in regard to Slavery, would ever be overcome or neutralized by the accession to the confederacy, of new slaveholding States. Yet, in the brief period which has elapsed—we may well say, brief, when viewed in connection with such great results—we have witnessed the addition of nine slaveholding, and only three non-slaveholding States to the confederacy, beyond those which were provided for before the adoption of the Constitution, making the slaveholding States themselves, more prominently active in the measure—the ordinance of 1787—by which six new States were first designed to be, and five actually were, arrayed on the same side. These added to the seven in which Slavery had been, or was expected to be abolished, would make the division in this regard, twelve to six. The evidence we possess of the circumstances and dispositions of the times, warrants us in assuming that no one, at that day, anticipated that this difference in the respective conditions of the States, in regard to Slavery, would ever be overcome or neutralized by the accession to the confederacy, of new slaveholding States. Yet, in the brief period which has elapsed—we may well say, brief, when viewed in connection with such great results—we have witnessed the addition of nine slaveholding, and only three non-slaveholding States to the confederacy, beyond those which were provided for before the adoption of the Constitution, making the slaveholding States themselves, more prominently active in the measure—the ordinance of 1787—by which six new States were first designed to be, and five actually were, arrayed on the same side. These added to the seven in which Slavery had been, or was expected to be abolished, would make the division in this regard, twelve to six. The evidence we possess of the circumstances and dispositions of the times, warrants us in assuming that no one, at that day, anticipated that this difference in the respective conditions of the States, in regard to Slavery, would ever be overcome or neutralized by the accession to the confederacy, of new slaveholding States. Yet, in the brief period which has elapsed—we may well say, brief, when viewed in connection with such great results—we have witnessed the addition of nine slaveholding, and only three non-slaveholding States to the confederacy, beyond those which were provided for before the adoption of the Constitution, making the slaveholding States themselves, more prominently active in the measure—the ordinance of 1787—by which six new States were first designed to be, and five actually were, arrayed on the same side. These added to the seven in which Slavery had been, or was expected to be abolished, would make the division in this regard, twelve to six. The evidence we possess of the circumstances and dispositions of the times, warrants us in assuming that no one, at that day, anticipated that this difference in the respective conditions of the States, in regard to Slavery, would ever be overcome or neutralized by the accession to the confederacy, of new slaveholding States. Yet, in the brief period which has elapsed—we may well say, brief, when viewed in connection with such great results—we have witnessed the addition of nine slaveholding, and only three non-slaveholding States to the confederacy, beyond those which were provided for before the adoption of the Constitution, making the slaveholding States themselves, more prominently active in the measure—the ordinance of 1787—by which six new States were first designed to be, and five actually were, arrayed on the same side. These added to the seven in which Slavery had been, or was expected to be abolished, would make the division in this regard, twelve to six. The evidence we possess of the circumstances and dispositions of the times, warrants us in assuming that no one, at that day, anticipated that this difference in the respective conditions of the States, in regard to Slavery, would ever be overcome or neutralized by the accession to the confederacy, of new slaveholding States. Yet, in the brief period which has elapsed—we may well say, brief, when viewed in connection with such great results—we have witnessed the addition of nine slaveholding, and only three non-slaveholding States to the confederacy, beyond those which were provided for before the adoption of the Constitution, making the slaveholding States themselves, more prominently active in the measure—the ordinance of 1787—by which six new States were first designed to be, and five actually were, arrayed on the same side. These added to the seven in which Slavery had been, or was expected to be abolished, would make the division in this regard, twelve to six. The evidence we possess of the circumstances and dispositions of the times, warrants us in assuming that no one, at that day, anticipated that this difference in the respective conditions of the States, in regard to Slavery, would ever be overcome or neutralized by the accession to the confederacy, of new slaveholding States. Yet, in the brief period which has elapsed—we may well say, brief, when viewed in connection with such great results—we have witnessed the addition of nine slaveholding, and only three non-slaveholding States to the confederacy, beyond those which were provided for before the adoption of the Constitution, making the slaveholding States themselves, more prominently active in the measure—the ordinance of 1787—by which six new States were first designed to be, and five actually were, arrayed on the same side. These added to the seven in which Slavery had been, or was expected to be abolished, would make the division in this regard, twelve to six. The evidence we possess of the circumstances and dispositions of the times, warrants us in assuming that no one, at that day, anticipated that this difference in the respective conditions of the States, in regard to Slavery, would ever be overcome or neutralized by the accession to the confederacy, of new slaveholding States. Yet, in the brief period which has elapsed—we may well say, brief, when viewed in connection with such great results—we have witnessed the addition of nine slaveholding, and only three non-slaveholding States to the confederacy, beyond those which were provided for before the adoption of the Constitution, making the slaveholding States themselves, more prominently active in the measure—the ordinance of 1787—by which six new States were first designed to be, and five actually were, arrayed on the same side. These added to the seven in which Slavery had been, or was expected to be abolished, would make the division in this regard, twelve to six. The evidence we possess of the circumstances and dispositions of the times, warrants us in assuming that no one, at that day, anticipated that this difference in the respective conditions of the States, in regard to Slavery, would ever be overcome or neutralized by the accession to the confederacy, of new slaveholding States. Yet, in the brief period which has elapsed—we may well say, brief, when viewed in connection with such great results—we have witnessed the addition of nine slaveholding, and only three non-slaveholding States to the confederacy, beyond those which were provided for before the adoption of the Constitution, making the slaveholding States themselves, more prominently active in the measure—the ordinance of 1787—by which six new States were first designed to be, and five actually were, arrayed on the same side. These added to the seven in which Slavery had been, or was expected to be abolished, would make the division in this regard, twelve to six. The evidence we possess of the circumstances and dispositions of the times, warrants us in assuming that no one, at that day, anticipated that this difference in the respective conditions of the States, in regard to Slavery, would ever be overcome or neutralized by the accession to the confederacy, of new slaveholding States. Yet, in the brief period which has elapsed—we may well say, brief, when viewed in connection with such great results—we have witnessed the addition of nine slaveholding, and only three non-slaveholding States to the confederacy, beyond those which were provided for before the adoption of the Constitution, making the slaveholding States themselves, more prominently active in the measure—the ordinance of 1787—by which six new States were first designed to be, and five actually were, arrayed on the same side. These added to the seven in which Slavery had been, or was expected to be abolished, would make the division in this regard, twelve to six. The evidence we possess of the circumstances and dispositions of the times, warrants us in assuming that no one, at that day, anticipated that this difference in the respective conditions of the States, in regard to Slavery, would ever be overcome or neutralized by the accession to the confederacy, of new slaveholding States. Yet, in the brief period which has elapsed—we may well say, brief, when viewed in connection with such great results—we have witnessed the addition of nine slaveholding, and only three non-slaveholding States to the confederacy, beyond those which were provided for before the adoption of the Constitution, making the slaveholding States themselves, more prominently active in the measure—the ordinance of 1787—by which six new States were first designed to be, and five actually were, arrayed on the same side. These added to the seven in which Slavery had been, or was expected to be abolished, would make the division in this regard, twelve to six. The evidence we possess of the circumstances and dispositions of the times, warrants us in assuming that no one, at that day, anticipated that this difference in the respective conditions of the States, in regard to Slavery, would ever be overcome or neutralized by the accession to the confederacy, of new slaveholding States. Yet, in the brief period which has elapsed—we may well say, brief, when viewed in connection with such great results—we have witnessed the addition of nine slaveholding, and only three non-slaveholding States to the confederacy, beyond those which were provided for before the adoption of the Constitution, making the slaveholding States themselves, more prominently active in the measure—the ordinance of 1787—by which six new States were first designed to be, and five actually were, arrayed on the same side. These added to the seven in which Slavery had been, or was expected to be abolished, would make the division in this regard, twelve to six. The evidence we possess of the circumstances and dispositions of the times, warrants us in assuming that no one, at that day, anticipated that this difference in the respective conditions of the States, in regard to Slavery, would ever be overcome or neutralized by the accession to the confederacy, of new slaveholding States. Yet, in the brief period which has elapsed—we may well say, brief, when viewed in connection with such great results—we have witnessed the addition of nine slaveholding, and only three non-slaveholding States to the confederacy, beyond those which were provided for before the adoption of the Constitution, making the slaveholding States themselves, more prominently active in the measure—the ordinance of 1787—by which six new States were first designed to be, and five actually were, arrayed on the same side. These added to the seven in which Slavery had been, or was expected to be abolished, would make the division in this regard, twelve to six. The evidence we possess of the circumstances and dispositions of the times, warrants us in assuming that no one, at that day, anticipated that this difference in the respective conditions of the States, in regard to Slavery, would ever be overcome or neutralized by the accession to the confederacy, of new slaveholding States. Yet, in the brief period which has elapsed—we may well say, brief, when viewed in connection with such great results—we have witnessed the addition of nine slaveholding, and only three non-slaveholding States to the confederacy, beyond those which were provided for before the adoption of the Constitution, making the slaveholding States themselves, more prominently active in the measure—the ordinance of 1787—by which six new States were first designed to be, and five actually were, arrayed on the same side. These added to the seven in which Slavery had been, or was expected to be abolished, would make the division in this regard, twelve to six. The evidence we possess of the circumstances and dispositions of the times, warrants us in assuming that no one, at that day, anticipated that this difference in the respective conditions of the States, in regard to Slavery, would ever be overcome or neutralized by the accession to the conf

this agitation. It was an agony of better things to come. He liked this mingling of heretofore discordant elements—drawn together by the great sympathetic cord of freedom. Vermont, New Hampshire, Missouri and Delaware, are here. And he was told that Maryland was here, and it was a fact of deeply momentous importance, when in the South they began to talk of the evils of Slavery. Virginia, "the mother of Presidents," was here. The feeling is extending, expanding, not only at the North, but at the South.

12 o'clock.

ORGANIZATION OF THE CONVENTION.

Judge Stephens of Indiana, called the meeting to order, and proposed NATHANIEL SAWYER, of Ohio, as President of the Convention *pro tem.*

Unanimously confirmed.

A resolution was passed to the effect that a committee of one from each State and one from the District of Columbia, be selected to draft a plan for the permanent organization of the Convention, and that such delegation appoint its representative. The States were called, and the following gentlemen were appointed as the Committee:

Maine—Jabez C. Woodman.

New Hampshire—George G. Fogg.

Vermont—E. D. Barber.

Massachusetts—John Jackson.

Rhode Island—Wm. G. Hammond.

Connecticut—Thaddeus Wells.

New York—Preston King, (Chairman.)

New Jersey—H. M. Conner.

Pennsylvania—Joseph Neide.

Ohio—S. P. Chase.

Michigan—Isaac P. Christiany.

Wisconsin—Hans Crocker.

Illinois—Issue N. Arnold.

Indiana—William Miller.

Indiana—Joseph L. Jarnigan.

Delaware—Jacob Pusey.

Maryland—William Robinson.

Virginia—George Craig.

District of Columbia—L. P. Noble.

Hon. Preston King, from the committee of one from each State, on the permanent organization of the Convention, unanimously recommended CHARLES F. ADAMS, of Mass., for President of the Convention.

That there be one Vice President from each State represented in this Convention, and one from the District of Columbia, to be selected by the Delegates from the several States.

The Doctor B. Sedgwick of N. Y., C. V. Dyer of Ill., Thomas Bolton of Ohio, Ralph Butler, Jr., of Maine, J. E. Snodgrass of Maryland, A. M. Johnson of New Jersey, Franklin Taylor of Penn., be Secretaries of the Convention.

George Rathbun of New York and S. P. Chase of Ohio, were appointed a committee to wait upon Mr. Adams, and announce to him his appointment.

Mr. Adams took his seat amid the vociferous and repeated cheering of the multitude.

The following Vice Presidents were then nominated by their respective State Delegations:

Maine—William Bradbury.

New Hampshire—Moses A. Cartland.

Vermont—Lawrence Brainerd.

Massachusetts—John Mills.

New Jersey—David L. Rogers.

Pennsylvania—E. D. Gazzam.

Ohio—Nicholas Spindle.

Illinois—S. J. Lowe.

Indiana—John W. Wright.

Wisconsin—Byron Kilbourne.

Iowa—William Mitter.

Michigan—Robert S. Wilson.

Maryland—Robert Gardiner.

Virginia—George Craig.

Rhode Island—Walter R. Danforth.

Delaware—A. H. Dixson.

District Columbia—L. B. Noble.

The delegation from New York not having agreed upon a nomination for Vice President, it was agreed to meet at 8 o'clock this evening for that purpose.

At the evening session, the proceedings were commenced with a prayer by Rev. Mr. Tucker of Buffalo.

Mr. Adams then arose and addressed the Convention in an opening speech, which was received with the most enthusiastic and long continued applause.

The Committee on Organization, &c., submitted the following further report, which was unanimously adopted:

This Convention assembled in pursuance of a recommendation of a Convention in the State of Ohio, held on the 28th day of June last. That Convention recommended the appointment of six delegates at large for each State that should choose to be represented, and three delegates from each Congressional District.

Several States have followed that recommendation as to the number of delegates, while in other States, County and District meetings have appointed, if enough are in attendance. If not, the number may be supplied by the delegates from said State, from any persons attending from said State.

Each Congressional District of a State represented, shall be entitled to three conferees. The regular delegates of the districts shall be such conferees, if enough are in attendance. If not, the number may be supplied by the delegates from said State, from any persons attending from said State.

The said conferees shall constitute a Committee of Conference, and shall have full power to sit during the sittings of the Convention, and to entertain and decide finally any question referred by the Convention, or any question that shall be originated in said Committee of Conference; and shall have full power on the subject of representation.

Any question in the Convention shall be referred to said Committee for its final action, upon the demand of one hundred members.

Josias R. Giddings of Ohio, came forward amidst cheering applause. We give a few extracts from his speech:

"Friends, countrymen and fellow-citizens: I know of no nobler spectacle that could be presented to the eye of the Patriot, Statesman, or lover of mankind, than to see a people assembled in mighty Convention, for the maintenance of their own inalienable rights; and when my Reverend friend here made such beautiful allusion to that venerable statesman, who has lately taken his departure from this to a brighter world, my heart involuntarily responded amiss to the sentiment he expressed. I firmly believe, that could that old man eloquent, that mighty and irresistible champion of human rights from early youth to extreme age, have lived to see this day, he would have said like him of old, 'Now, Lord, let thy servant depart in peace, since mine eyes have seen thy salvation.' [Great applause.]

The beautiful allusion, made in the prayer to which you listened this morning, to the Pilgrim Fathers who were tempest-tossed upon a wintry and storm-ridden sea, as they fled from political oppression at home, and sought to establish this ever-living principle of man's inalienable rights upon the shores of Massachusetts, reminded me, that in that same year—yes, fellow-citizens, in that same year that our pilgrim Sires landed upon those inclement shores, a Dutch ship, freighted with humanity made merchantable by the superior fraud and powers of piratical dealers in human flesh and blood, landed upon our coast at Jamestown, in Virginia. Yes, the element of slavery and degradation was established in the same year that our Pilgrim Fathers established Human Liberty upon the wild New England shores. And these anachronistic principles have been spreading and widening, and pushing out, and bearing fruit from that day to the present. And while New England has been, with devotion to her country, her God, and to mankind, endeavoring to extend her principles of liberty, Southern States have been eagerly and energetically engaged in extending and perpetuating Human Degradation and Slavery. And that institution existed when it was first brought upon the Southern shores of these States precisely as it

is now sought to be established in California and New Mexico. It was established there by force of the physical and intellectual superiority of the whites over the colored race. In violation of heaven's high decree, the white man seized his fellow colored man and compelled him to submit to his will. That state of the degraded African existed for years with no other law to sustain it than now exists in New Mexico and California.

Well, gentlemen, you all know that I opposed Martin Van Buren with all my powers. I left no stone unturned in '44 to defeat his election. Martin Van Buren rejected Texas in '37. She was then at war with Mexico. In '44 the slaveholders of Mississippi interrogated him upon this subject, which with them, was the transcendental question of all others, and he declared his opposition to the Annexation of Texas, in '34. "This is a matter of truth and of history, and I declare it to be the brightest spot in his political life. There was in that set perfect a contrast, a perfect antithesis to his present position as I understand it. You will understand that I am not an advocate of Martin Van Buren for for the Presidency. Why? Because no part of it lies below 36 deg. 30 min. No, it lies four or five degrees above, and most of it in 42 deg. Why then? Why, because southern men say they won't vote for any President of the United States, unless he is in favor of allowing Slavery south of 31 deg. 30 min., and therefore although all Oregon lies north of 42 deg, they will not give a law giving a government to Oregon, unless, *pari passu*, you will pass a law authorizing slavery in the territory south of 36 deg. 30 min. These territories are not on the footing of the old territories, and when they put the question to us, will you help abolish Freedom there and plant Slavery in its stead, we of the New York Democracy said no. We never have been blamed for not going far enough with you, but we have often been blamed for going too far; and fellow-citizens if you allow the federal government to take one step forward to abolish Freedom and establish Slavery in the territory required by unrighteous war, you become party to the enormity, and the guilt rests upon every soul that takes part in it."

therefore, I say to our national legislators, that before they attempt to pass another compromise, they will wait and let the people express their opinions next November, and enable every man to say whether or not it is Christianslike and becoming a free people to abolish Freedom in Mexico and California, and plant Slavery there, and in the name of all that is right and just and true, if they would not make our name a hissing and a byword throughout the earth, let this Congress withhold their hands from the passage of such an act, and especially, let the House of Representatives adhere to the position they have taken, and lay the bill on the table, only by a majority of 15, but by three to 15. [Applause.]

There is another point which I wish you to observe. This committee bill would have shuffled this matter off upon the Supreme Court. The Constitution says the Congress of the United States, not the Supreme Court, nor any other judicial tribunal, however learned it may be, shall have power to make laws regulating territories.

Well, now, here are three territories, Oregon, New Mexico and California. Well, now, they won't give the people of Oregon a government—Why? Because no part of it lies below 36 deg. 30 min. No, it lies four or five degrees above, and most of it in 42 deg. Why then? Why, because southern men say they won't vote for any President of the United States, unless he is in favor of allowing Slavery south of 31 deg. 30 min., and therefore although all Oregon lies north of 42 deg, they will not give a law giving a government to Oregon, unless, *pari passu*, you will pass a law authorizing slavery in the territory south of 36 deg. 30 min. These territories are not on the footing of the old territories, and when they put the question to us, will you help abolish Freedom there and plant Slavery in its stead, we of the New York Democracy said no. We never have been blamed for not going far enough with you, but we have often been blamed for going too far; and fellow-citizens if you allow the federal government to take one step forward to abolish Freedom and establish Slavery in the territory required by unrighteous war, you become party to the enormity, and the guilt rests upon every soul that takes part in it."

SECOND DAY.

THURSDAY MORNING, August 10.

The meeting was called to order by the President, and its deliberations opened with prayer by the Rev. S. J. May, of Syracuse.

Addresses were made by Messrs Briggs of Ohio, Cummings of Mass., and Birkshire of Virginia, Editor of an anti-slavery paper called *The Crisis*.

Judge NYE again spoke, and concluded with a very beautiful and appropriate anathema against any one who would attempt or countenance in any form or manner, a dissolution of the Union.

The President said that as evidence of the strong interest which was manifested in the proceedings of the Convention, he had just had placed in his hands the following telegraphic communication:

Exhibit one issue—one front—one nomination— courage—enthusiasm—anticipate victory.

WILLIAM WILSON.

Pastor of the Church of Coopersburg, Cincinnati, 10th August.

Mr. SEDGWICK of Syracuse, and Mr. GIDDINGS spoke.

The President announced that Mr. Butler of New York, Chairman of the Committee of Reconstruction, would now read the report of the committee. This announcement was received with three cheers. Mr. Butler then came forward and remarked, that he had the inexpressible pleasure of announcing that the report which he was about to read to them was the unanimous report of the whole committee. This announcement was received with the most enthusiastic applause.

Whereas, We have assembled in Convention, as a union of Free-men, for the sake of Freedom, forgetting all past political differences in a common cause to maintain the rights of Free Labor against the aggressions of the Slave Power, and secure Free Soil for a Free People;

And whereas, The political Conventions recently assembled at Baltimore and Philadelphia, in one stoning the voice of a great constituency, destined to be heard in its deliberations, and the other abandoning its distinctive principles for mere暖昧, have dissolved the National party organization heretofore existing by nominating for the chief magistracy of the United States, under slaveholding domination, candidates, neither of whom can be supported by the opponents of slavery-extension without a sacrifice of consistency, duty, and self-respect;

And whereas, These nominations, so made, furnish the occasion and demonstrate the necessity of the union of the people under the banner of Free Democracy, in a solemn and formal declaration of their independence of the Slave Power, and of their fixed determination to rescue the Federal Government from its control;

Resolved, That we, the old Democrats—those who have preceded me, have abdicated, with great profligacy and infidelity of language and thought, to the executive and legislative assemblies under which we have convened, for the first time in our political history, of a Convention assembled from seventeen States in the Union, and the capital—convening thousands of miles, and doing as they do and have done heretofore, oftentimes in secret and most exciting conflicts, to open questions of great magnitude, yet forgetting all their differences, and bringing together a congregation of free hearts and free minds, for the purpose of deliberating upon the whole committee's report, which has been submitted to the American people since we have been a nation. And it is, indeed, a spectacle as sublime and exhilarating, as it is noble and extraordinary.

Here we are, old actors upon the political boards. I barely allude to my actions, merely to say that I am not here to undo, or to redress, any thing that I have ever done before or said. Not that I am infallible. I am man with the errors of a man.

With regard to the errors that I have committed, I will say that they were not errors of the heart, but errors of the head, and I am very free to say that now, that a new question has come up in which I, as an humble American citizen, am required to deliberate and act, I have tried to meet that question, within just sense of my responsibility to my fellow men, and to Him who is the judge of the heart, and shall weigh all the actions of my life, and shall weigh all the actions of men—the question whether freedom shall be abolished in four or five thousand square miles of free territory and plant the curse of human slavery in these square miles or not.

Resolved, That we, the old Democrats—those who have preceded me, have abdicated, with great profligacy and infidelity of language and thought, to the executive and legislative assemblies under which we have convened, for the first time in our political history, of a Convention assembled from seventeen States in the Union, and the capital—convening thousands of miles, and doing as they do and have done heretofore, oftentimes in secret and most exciting conflicts, to open questions of great magnitude, yet forgetting all their differences, and bringing together a congregation of free hearts and free minds, for the purpose of deliberating upon the whole committee's report, which has been submitted to the American people since we have been a nation. And it is, indeed, a spectacle as sublime and exhilarating, as it is noble and extraordinary.

Resolved, That we, the old Democrats—those who have preceded me, have abdicated, with great profligacy and infidelity of language and thought, to the executive and legislative assemblies under which we have convened, for the first time in our political history, of a Convention assembled from seventeen States in the Union, and the capital—convening thousands of miles, and doing as they do and have done heretofore, oftentimes in secret and most exciting conflicts, to open questions of great magnitude, yet forgetting all their differences, and bringing together a congregation of free hearts and free minds, for the purpose of deliberating upon the whole committee's report, which has been submitted to the American people since we have been a nation. And it is, indeed, a spectacle as sublime and exhilarating, as it is noble and extraordinary.

Resolved, That we, the old Democrats—those who have preceded me, have abdicated, with great profligacy and infidelity of language and thought, to the executive and legislative assemblies under which we have convened, for the first time in our political history, of a Convention assembled from seventeen States in the Union, and the capital—convening thousands of miles, and doing as they do and have done heretofore, oftentimes in secret and most exciting conflicts, to open questions of great magnitude, yet forgetting all their differences, and bringing together a congregation of free hearts and free minds, for the purpose of deliberating upon the whole committee's report, which has been submitted to the American people since we have been a nation. And it is, indeed, a spectacle as sublime and exhilarating, as it is noble and extraordinary.

Resolved, That we, the old Democrats—those who have preceded me, have abdicated, with great profligacy and infidelity of language and thought, to the executive and legislative assemblies under which we have convened, for the first time in our political history, of a Convention assembled from seventeen States in the Union, and the capital—convening thousands of miles, and doing as they do and have done heretofore, oftentimes in secret and most exciting conflicts, to open questions of great magnitude, yet forgetting all their differences, and bringing together a congregation of free hearts and free minds, for the purpose of deliberating upon the whole committee's report, which has been submitted to the American people since we have been a nation. And it is, indeed, a spectacle as sublime and exhilarating, as it is noble and extraordinary.

Resolved, That we, the old Democrats—those who have preceded me, have abdicated, with great profligacy and infidelity of language and thought, to the executive and legislative assemblies under which we have convened, for the first time in our political history, of a Convention assembled from seventeen States in the Union, and the capital—convening thousands of miles, and doing as they do and have done heretofore, oftentimes in secret and most exciting conflicts, to open questions of great magnitude, yet forgetting all their differences, and bringing together a congregation of free hearts and free minds, for the purpose of deliberating upon the whole committee's report, which has been submitted to the American people since we have been a nation. And it is, indeed, a spectacle as sublime and exhilarating, as it is noble and extraordinary.

Resolved, That we, the old Democrats—those who have preceded me, have abdicated, with great profligacy and infidelity of language and thought, to the executive and legislative assemblies under which we have convened, for the first time in our political history, of a Convention assembled from seventeen States in the Union, and the capital—convening thousands of miles, and doing as they do and have done heretofore, oftentimes in secret and most exciting conflicts, to open questions of great magnitude, yet forgetting all their differences, and bringing together a congregation of free hearts and free minds, for the purpose of deliberating upon the whole committee's report, which has been submitted to the American people since we have been a nation. And it is, indeed, a spectacle as sublime and exhilarating, as it is noble and extraordinary.

Resolved, That we, the old Democrats—those who have preceded me, have abdicated, with great profligacy and infidelity of language and thought, to the executive and legislative assemblies under which we have convened, for the first time in our political history, of a Convention assembled from seventeen States in the Union, and the capital—convening thousands of miles, and doing as they do and have done heretofore, oftentimes in secret and most exciting conflicts, to open questions of great magnitude, yet forgetting all their differences, and bringing together a congregation of free hearts and free minds, for the purpose of deliberating upon the whole committee's report, which has been submitted to the American people since we have been a nation. And it is, indeed, a spectacle as sublime and exhilarating, as it is noble and extraordinary.

Resolved, That we, the old Democrats—those who have preceded me, have abdicated, with great profligacy and infidelity of language and thought, to the executive and legislative assemblies under which we have convened, for the first time in our political history, of a Convention assembled from seventeen States in the Union, and the capital—convening thousands of miles, and doing as they do and have done heretofore, oftentimes in secret and most exciting conflicts, to open questions of great magnitude, yet forgetting all their differences, and bringing together a congregation of free hearts and free minds, for the purpose of deliberating upon the whole committee's report, which has been submitted to the American people since we have been a nation. And it is, indeed, a spectacle as sublime and exhilarating, as it is noble and extraordinary.

Resolved, That we, the old Democrats—those who have preceded me, have abdicated, with great profligacy and infidelity of language and thought, to the executive and legislative assemblies under which we have convened, for the first time in our political history, of a Convention assembled from seventeen States in the Union, and the capital—convening thousands of miles, and doing as they do and have done heretofore, oftentimes in secret and most exciting conflicts, to open questions of great magnitude, yet forgetting all their differences, and bringing together a congregation of free hearts and free minds, for the purpose of deliberating upon the whole committee's report, which has been submitted to the American people since we have been a nation. And it is, indeed, a spectacle as sublime and

MR. VAN BUREN'S LETTER.

We have given this document in full in this week's paper, both because many of our readers would not see it otherwise, and because it is of permanent interest as one of the monuments which Public Opinion, as it marches onwards, leaves behind it to mark its progress. It gives, we believe, entire satisfaction to those to whom it is addressed. And with justice, for it is all that men limiting their movement to the Platform of the Buffalo Convention can ask. It accepts that platform in full; is explicit and emphatic on the subject of Slave-Extension; thinks circumstances have so far changed as to justify him in approving an act for the Abolition of Slavery in the District, though he does not think it advisable; and adopts the views of the Convention as to Internal Improvements, Public Lands, and a Revenue Tariff. It makes Mr. Van Buren out to be a very suitable candidate for the Conscience Whigs, the Barnburning Democrats, the Liberty party, and for all, generally, who are content to keep Slavery where it is, and to fight it with their hands tied with the compromises woven by their fathers, and worn willingly by themselves.

We have no particular faith in the political honesty of those politicians who profess to be strongly impressed with the importance of the principles incarnated in Mr. Van Buren, who yet refuse to support him on the ground of his former misdeeds, and give these votes to Taylor or Cass as men to be preferred to him. In politics it will not do to inquire too curiously into the past history of men prominent enough to be Presidential candidates. Bygones must be allowed to be bygones. A man's present position, his contemporary pledges, must be admitted for the purposes of political qualification. Men who are frightened from their political propriety by the spectre of Mr. Van Buren are of course a contamination to last long, even with the most industrious patching. They would soon have come to an untimely end, by some other dismember. The new party have gained a loss in their demise. It is absurd for men willing to act under the Constitution, and to be true to its compromises, to boggle at the nomination of Mr. Van Buren or Mr. anybody else, to be their chief architect in maintaining them, who will consent to do it in the way they like the best. Mr. Van Buren will answer the purpose of the party that has nominated him, in victory or in defeat, as well as any body.

But though Mr. Van Buren will do very well for the Movement Whigs, Democrats and Third Party Men, he is far enough from coming up to the mark of the Abolitionists. His whole argument rests upon the interference of Slavery with Northern influence and rights, and the danger of its power being augmented and perpetuated by its extension over new territories. He has nothing to say, except slightly and inferentially, against Slavery itself. He is professedly respectful to the Slave States and Slaveholders, and piously regardful of the Compromises of the Constitution. Now this is all what the new party want. He and they should be all this. They contemplate remaining in a Slaveholding Union, and putting forth the united strength of the confederacy for the maintenance of slavery within its appropriate sphere. He justly represents the party in all this. He plainly states the grievance of the non-slaveholding States, as it lies in his mind;—that they have been disappointed of the political supremacy, the expectation of which induced them to assist in investing the slaveholding States with the privileges and guarantees of the Constitution. Which means, being interpreted, in engaging to let them import slaves for twenty years, to send back their exports, to put down their insurrections, and to give them three votes for every five slaves. And it is not the atrocity of the bargain that shocks Mr. Van Buren so much, but the being overreached in the consideration.

Mr. Van Buren, it will be observed, does not belong, if he ever heard of it, to that school of constitutional lawyers and divines, who have discovered, some of them, that there is nothing about slavery in the Constitution, and others, that the last was made for the express, or at least, the necessary purpose, of abolishing the first! He does not attempt to rail the seal from off the bond, but honestly acknowledges that it was the pound of flesh next the slave's heart that was secured by it. And had the Shylocks of the South been content with this, and not sharpened their knives for Northern breasts, for all that appears, the Free Soil party never would have existed, and the latter days of Mr. Van Buren would have gone down in peace at Lindenwald. He is too knowing a man to attempt, on the one hand, to prove by a logical process that the great, bloody, cruel, ravenous American eagle is, after all, merely a harmless dove, or, on the other, to catch and tame him by putting salt upon his tail. It has, apparently, never occurred to him, neophyte that he is, that the fundamental law means the opposite of what it appears to be upon its face, of what it is explained by history and has been interpreted by the Courts to mean, and of what the practice of sixty years shows to have been the universal understanding of its purpose. 'If his slave runs away,' says he, 'and enters one of the non-slaveholding States, he does not thereby become free, but shall be delivered up upon the claim of the person entitled to his services.' But this is not in consequence of the recognition of the right of property in such person, notwithstanding the State laws; but in virtue of an express article of the Constitution, which constitutes one of its compromises upon the subject of slavery. A cool, but accurate statement of the mean, cruel, damnable relation of all intending fidelity to the Constitution, to the Slave-masters!

Mr. Van Buren is at great pains to exculpate the Wilber Proviso from the imputation of being disloyal to the slaveholding States! He talks a deal of twaddle about 'the true glory of the Confederacy,' and of 'the humiliation of a part tarnishing the glory of the whole.' He thinks that the Northern people are 'so national in their feelings' and cherish 'deep a solicitude for the honor and welfare of all its members,' that if they believed the success of this measure would draw after it such grave consequences, they would be among the last to uphold it! Polite Mr. Van Buren! We always heard he was a well-bred gentleman, but he seems to be the very poor of courtesy and mirror of knighthood. Lord Chesterfield was a bore to him! The glory of a slaveholding Nation! The honor of woman-whipping and baby-stealing ruffians! Surely, this is a specimen of what is called 'being most internally polite'!

We think Mr. Van Buren is quite out in his inference that because the Slave States were in favor of the Ordinance of 1787, that it was from any pre-dilection for freedom. It was because they were jealous of the competition of new States in their own departments of production, and because the prohibition of the Foreign trade had not given rise to the Great American System or the Protection of the Domestic Manufacture of Men, that they were eager with their concurrence. Who believes those men would be thus unanimous now, were the work to do again? Equally strange appears to us his way of looking at passing events, if he were induced to declare his intention of voting an Act for Abolishing Slavery in the District by the apprehension of a servile war! If 'the extent to which this subject was pressed' created such a danger then, surely, it must be ten times greater now. And, yet, Mr. Van Buren will not vote a Bill now! A servile war, three millions of unarmed, uneducated slaves fight-

against seventeen millions of intelligent enemies, armed to the teeth? Does Mr. Van Buren think there can be any fear, or any hope, of such a war as long as this Union endures?

But we have no purpose of criticizing this letter. It speaks for itself. It is all that voters under the Constitution have a right to ask. Mr. Van Buren fitly represents the party of which he is the head. He will oppose the extension of Slavery over New States. But he will maintain its constitutional rights in the Old. He will still deliver up the fugitive slave to the tyrant out of whose hand he has escaped. If a Slave Revolution is an foot, he will crush it with the whole force of the Nation. He will uphold the Oligarchy which rules over us, by maintaining their right to rule by virtue of their ownership in human flesh. All this he must do, if he be true to the Constitution. He will swear to support All this, they who appoint him their minister by their ballots, empower and instruct him to do, by the terms of that Commission which they give him. Mr. Van Buren and his party, leave the master of Slavery where it was twenty years ago. They do not propose to meddle with its existence, provided it can live where it is. They only hope to curb its further progress. This is vastly better than nothing. It is a step in the right direction, over which we rejoice. But we cannot but see that it is but a very short and uncertain step. A step which might as well have not been taken, if it be not the precursor of another. And there is no other step to be taken within the Constitution. This touches its extreme bounds. The Abolitionists have transcended its limits. They refuse to be bound by it, and consequently, to bind others by it. They stand outside of it, and demand a purer Constitution and a holier Union. All they have to do at this crisis, is, to stand firmly in their present advanced and imprudent position, and urge upon all genuine enemies of slavery to come up and do battle by their side.—q.

NATHAN APPLETON'S DISCOURSE OF SLAVERY.

In the portion of the first page which we have appropriated as a Museum for the preservation and exhibition of moral anomalies and curiosities of wickedness, will be found to-day, a letter from the Hon. Nathan Appleton, which well deserves a place in this repository. It is invaluable as a specimen of the pro-slavery of twenty years since. Any one, whose memory does not run so far back, will there see how almost every body used to talk in those times. It is like a resurrection of a long-buried form of pro-slavery.

'It's a corps set up for show,
Galvanized at times to go.'

Mr. Appleton, plainly, has preserved his moral identity in an extraordinary manner. It has not undergone that flux and reflux of ideas which, in general, insensibly but essentially change the character of every one's mind, just as the body is renewed by the change of its particles, every seven years. But there are no clairvoyances in Mr. Appleton's moral nature. What he was twenty years ago, he is now. All the agitation that has shaken the moral atmosphere around him, all the light that has been poured about him, all the experience of twenty years, have produced no effect upon him. As far as the most important political and moral element of the world he is concerned, he is an uninformed, as narrow-minded, as full of ignorant assumption and vulgar prejudice, as he was then. He stands as the representative, let us hope, the only one, of a bygone generation. Like the Bourbons, he has 'learned nothing, and forgot nothing'—he is neither wiser nor better, as respects this matter, by the teachings of a score of years.

He endorses the Colonization Scheme, of course, though he does not think it has any important bearing upon the extinction of slavery in the United States; or, as is most probable, because he sees that it was wholly unsafe policy; it was not suitable to the Whig character; it was short-sighted temporizing upon questions of great principle! 'There is no man more firmly of opinion that such a motion was *not fit to make*!' But then the choice being, virtually, between Taylor and Cass, and Cass being the bitter pill of the two to swallow, he will make a wry face andgulp down Taylor. The bulk of the speech is made up of an exposition of the iniquities of Mr. Van Buren and of General Cass, and to show that they are worse than a man not fit to be nominated. And the Defender of the Constitution goes on to expand that this is the necessary result of our form of government and of the provisions of the Constitution! These ingredients, with a strong spice of glorification of the Whig Party and of himself, their labors against Slavery, make up the composition of this dainty dish. We have long wished that the Whigs might get it; and we now hope they like it.

promotion,—would furnish his enemies with such a weapon against himself. It is tying a millstone round his own neck, if he had any wish to keep his head above water. It must be that, having had all he wanted, politically, and being rich enough to indulge in such luxury, he sought to relieve himself thus of the perilous stuff that weighed upon his heart.' That it is a mere ebullition of spleen, an overflowing of pro-slavery bile, a confession of the state of his mind to this Colonization Father, and made public by way of penance. We can account for such a display of heartless absurdity, of so weak and foolish, and at the same time, so wicked a state of mind, in no other way. And yet this is the man whom Boston has once or twice selected to represent her, and who is considered one of the leaders of the Whig party! Truly, it doth not require much wisdom to govern the world,—or at least, this part of it!—q.

THE ORACLE AT MASHFIELD.

Mr. Webster's mouth is opened at last. After an ominous silence of four months, he grows out a sturdy consciousness with the nomination of General Taylor as on the whole, better than that of General Cass. He does not attempt to disguise the fact that the whigs of Massachusetts do not like going to the camp for a President. He does not think Taylor a second Washington, or even a second Harrison. He nails the Brummagem Washington the Whigs have been trying to pass current to the counter, with a will. But he has been fairly (5) nominated, and on the whole Mr. Webster thinks he must be a Whig, (or if not a Whig, what is he?) and so he shall support him. Mr. Webster does not believe a word of the assertion that Slavery had anything to do with the nomination! Many of the Northern members who voted for him had no such purpose. This is literally true, no doubt. Mr. Ashmun, and even Mr. Lunt, we apprehend, have no predilections for the extension of Slavery; but they think it a very small matter compared with the success of the Whig Party, and so they fall in with the Slaveholding current.

This is the way in which Mr. Webster 'backs his friends.' 'I do not admire their discretion or policy'—who nominated General Taylor. In my opinion, he was wholly unsafe policy; it was not suitable to the Whig character; it was short-sighted temporizing upon questions of great principle! 'There is no man more firmly of opinion that such a motion was *not fit to make*!' But then the choice being, virtually, between Taylor and Cass, and Cass being the bitter pill of the two to swallow, he will make a wry face andgulp down Taylor. The bulk of the speech is made up of an exposition of the iniquities of Mr. Van Buren and of General Cass, and to show that they are worse than a man not fit to be nominated. And the Defender of the Constitution goes on to expand that this is the necessary result of our form of government and of the provisions of the Constitution! These ingredients, with a strong spice of glorification of the Whig Party and of himself, their labors against Slavery, make up the composition of this dainty dish. We have long wished that the Whigs might get it; and we now hope they like it.

In justice to Miss Parkes we must add that the author based upon this translation was wholly voluntary, a free-will offering to the Anti-Slavery cause, and a proof of her zealous attachment to it. Nowhere has the slave finer or truer friends than in Bristol.

The translator has given an original Preface, introducing the work in a judicious and appropriate manner to its French readers. We may perhaps give a translation of this Preface in a future number of the Liberator.

In justice to Miss Parkes we must add that the author based upon this translation was wholly voluntary, a free-will offering to the Anti-Slavery cause, and a proof of her zealous attachment to it. Nowhere has the slave finer or truer friends than in Bristol.

We have observed, in reading the Narrative, a few errors of the French printer in giving some of the names of persons and places; but they are of slight importance.—q.

THE BLACKSTONE CHRONICLE.

We regret to see by the last number of this excellent paper that it is to be discontinued, and we regret the more to learn that it is from the want of the patronage and assistance, the promise of which was the inducement of Mr. Johnson to connect himself with it. All who have seen the paper, or know Oliver Johnson, know that it has failed from no want of editorial ability, business tact, or personal industry. Mr. Johnson makes a calm and candid statement of the expectations which were held out to him in engaging in this undertaking, and of the manner in which they were disappointed. We are very sorry that he should have spent six months to so little advantage to himself. That his paper has done good we know. That the Blackstone people do not know what is for their own interest, we are sure. We hope, however, that this disappointment may be the means of restoring him to active service in some department of the A. S. Cause, of which he has been one of the most faithful, as he was one of the earliest, champions.—q.

THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF SLAVERY.

Mr. Appleton has received a pamphlet form, the excellent article of Mr. William L. Bowditch, in the last Massachusetts Quarterly, on the great question, 'Does the Constitution of the United States, rightly interpreted, support slavery?' Mr. Bowditch clears away the clouds of dust which have been raised for the purpose of blinding the eyes of the people, with much ability, and makes the whole way so clear, that the wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein. He has dealt with his subject like a lawyer, a man of common sense, and an honest man. He places the pro-slavery character of the Constitution in the clear light in which its own terms, the construction of the courts and the consent of the people had combined to place it, until certain ingenious gentlemen chose to signalize the keenness of their optics, not by seeing what was not to be seen, but refusing to see what was plain as the sun at noonday to all eyes but theirs. Its argument is compact that it is difficult to select a portion of its chainmail as a specimen, so important is each part to the continuity of the whole. We shall endeavor to give the peroration, at least, hereafter.—q.

THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF SLAVERY.

We have received a pamphlet form, the excellent article of Mr. William L. Bowditch, in the last Massachusetts Quarterly, on the great question,

'Does the Constitution of the United States, rightly interpreted, support slavery?' Mr. Bowditch clears away the clouds of dust which have been raised for the purpose of blinding the eyes of the people, with much ability, and makes the whole way so clear, that the wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein. He has dealt with his subject like a lawyer, a man of common sense, and an honest man. He places the pro-slavery character of the Constitution in the clear light in which its own terms,

'As to the extinction of Slavery in the slave States, secured by the Constitution, I see no reason why the free States should make ourselves very unhappy about it. Why not leave it to the parties immediately concerned?' What party is more immediately concerned, than that which has secured, and does secure, the extension of Slavery in the United States? Who should repeat, if not the accessory to a crime? But, according to Mr. A's morality, Frank Knapp, who only watched the house while Dick Crownsheld murdered old Mr. White, 'had no reason to make himself very unhappy about it.' His conscience should be saved harmless by the compact between him and the assainer!

Mr. Appleton thinks 'interference always distasteful, sometimes hateful, especially when accompanied by denunciations of sinfulness'. We wonder whether Mr. A. is a *caveat emptor*, or whether he supports a minister, and if so, what for? 'The question of sinfulness should be kept, where it belongs, between the individual and his Maker.' Does Mr. A. apply this rule to the man who steals his spoons? But it is the question of property, after all, that is the insurmountable difficulty. 'For slaves are property, to all intents and purposes, in the States which have established Slavery.' (5) Property is essentially the creature of legislation! And yet Mr. A. has said just before, that 'a natural right' cannot be founded on an original wrong! This is the first time, we believe, that this atrocious doctrine, which constitutes one of its compromises upon the subject of slavery. A cool, but accurate statement of the mean, cruel, damnable relation of all intending fidelity to the Constitution, to the Slave-masters!

Mr. Van Buren is at great pains to exculpate the Wilber Proviso from the imputation of being disloyal to the slaveholding States! He talks a deal of twaddle about 'the true glory of the Confederacy,' and of 'the humiliation of a part tarnishing the glory of the whole.'

He thinks that the Northern people are 'so national in their feelings' and cherish 'deep a solicitude for the honor and welfare of all its members,'

that if they believed the success of this measure would draw after it such grave consequences,

they would be among the last to uphold it!

Polite Mr. Van Buren! We always heard he was a well-bred gentleman, but he seems to be the very poor of courtesy and mirror of knighthood. Lord Chesterfield was a bore to him! The glory of a slaveholding Nation! The honor of woman-whipping and baby-stealing ruffians! Surely, this is a specimen of what is called 'being most internally polite'!

We think Mr. Van Buren is quite out in his inference that because the Slave States were in favor of the Ordinance of 1787, that it was from any pre-dilection for freedom. It was because they were jealous of the competition of new States in their own departments of production, and because the prohibition of the Foreign trade had not given rise to the Great American System or the Protection of the Domestic Manufacture of Men, that they were eager with their concurrence. Who believes those men would be thus unanimous now, were the work to do again? Equally strange appears to us his way of looking at passing events, if he were induced to declare his intention of voting an Act for Abolishing Slavery in the District by the apprehension of a servile war!

If 'the extent to which this subject was pressed' created such a danger then, surely, it must be ten times greater now. And, yet, Mr. Van Buren will not vote a Bill now!

A servile war, three millions of unarmed, uneducated slaves fight-

against seventeen millions of intelligent enemies, armed to the teeth? Does Mr. Van Buren think there can be any fear, or any hope, of such a war as long as this Union endures?

But we have no purpose of criticizing this letter. It speaks for itself. It is all that voters under the Constitution have a right to ask. Mr. Van Buren fitly represents the party of which he is the head.

He will oppose the extension of Slavery over New States. But he will maintain its constitutional rights in the Old. He will still deliver up the fugitive slave to the tyrant out of whose hand he has escaped.

If a Slave Revolution is an foot, he will crush it with the whole force of the Nation.

He will uphold the Oligarchy which rules over us, by maintaining their right to rule by virtue of their ownership in human flesh.

All this he must do, if he be true to the Constitution.

He will swear to support All this, they who appoint him their minister by their ballots, empower and instruct him to do, by the terms of that Commission which they give him.

Mr. Van Buren and his party, leave the master of Slavery where it was twenty years ago.

They do not propose to meddle with its existence, provided it can live where it is.

They only hope to curb its further progress.

This is vastly better than nothing.

It is a step in the right direction, over which we rejoice.

But we cannot but see that it is but a very short and uncertain step.

A step which might as well have not been taken, if it be not the precursor of another.

And yet this is the man whom Boston has once or twice selected to represent her, and who is considered one of the leaders of the Whig party!

Truly, it doth not require much wisdom to govern the world,—or at least, this part of it!—q.

THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

for September has been published by Crosby & Nichols. Its contents are—1 Amusements; 2 Zwingle and Luther; 3 Republic of Liberia; 4 Christianity and Socialism; 5 Common School Education; 6 Tendencies and Wants of Theology; 7 Vincent Bourne and Modern Latinities; 8 Memoirs of Channing; 9 Rev. O. W. Br. Peabody; 10 Martineau's Eastern Life; Notices of New Publications and Intelligence.

Among the writers in the present number are Rev.

Ephraim Peabody, Rev. G. W. Burnside of Baltimore, and Rev. W. H. Furness of Philadelphia.

The author of the article on Liberia we suppose to be Rev. Joseph H. Allen of Washington, D. C. He claims to write with impartiality, and to give a fair view of the condition and prospects of Liberia, 'as far as they can be accurately known.'

But

